REMARKS

A. As to the Specification

The erroneous printing of the abstract on the last page of the claims has been corrected.

B. As to the Claims

1. Section 112 Rejections

Claims 7-12 have been amended to remove the term "variety" from the recitation. Claims 7-18 have been amended to correct the erroneous use of the term "comprising" in a Markush-type claim.

2. Section 102 and 103 Rejections

Claim 1 has been amended to more precisely recite the structural size limitation claimed for the center bore. As originally presented, the center bore was defined as being large enough to pass over "line hardware." The Examiner cited several prior art references featuring much smaller center bores. However, since one could argue that "line hardware" includes the eye of a hook (which is quite small), the prior art references arguably anticipated the present invention.

The present invention functions differently from the prior art. FIG. 1 shows the inclusion of a prior art swivel (16) in the fishing line. The soluble attractant slug can be placed on the line while the artificial lure is trailing through the water well behind the trolling vessel. FIGs. 4-7 show how the slug is placed on the line. The center bore is made large enough to allow the slug to pass over a swivel (a fairly large item) on its way back to the lure. FIGs. 14-16 show how the slug slides back to the lure. FIG. 17 then shows how the dissolving attractant flows turbulently around the lure.

None of the prior art references disclose these features as presently claimed. Lawrence discloses a very small center bore. Visser shows a small center bore with an enlarged trailing portion which could pass over a swivel. However, Visser does not include the limit that the enlarged bore extends over the entire length of the bore, as now recited in claim 1.

Buccilli discloses a center bore which clearly cannot pass over a swivel (Please observe the swivel illustrated in Buccilli's FIG. 1 and the center bore diameter illustrated in FIGs. 2 and 13). Bujaky and Cleeland likewise show small center bores which are not capable of passing over a swivel.

As amended, the claims contain a significant structural limitation which is not found in the prior art. This limitation is essential to the function of the present invention, as illustrated in FIGs. 14-16. Accordingly, the claims are now believed to be novel and non-obvious. The Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections.

Respectfully submitted this 19th day of July, 2004.

(54,141)

FOR

JOHN WILEY HORTON
Pennington, Moore, Wilkinson, Bell
& Dunbar, P.A.
P.O. Drawer 10095
Tallahassee, FL 32302-2095
850-222-3533
Reg. No. 41,851
Attorney for Applicants